

mechanism when the patient bed mechanism again moves in the aforementioned movement direction.

In the Office Action dated October 19, 2005, claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ueyama (United States Patent No. 5,204,629). In the substantiating this rejection at pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner cited the Abstract and column 3, lines 15-50 and column 4, lines 53-68 of the Ueyama reference as disclosing a coupling unit that the Examiner stated couples a gradient coil unit to a patient bed mechanism. The Examiner did not provide any indication that the Ueyama reference discloses or suggests a gradient coil unit that is movable into and out of the examination space, nor did the Examiner provide any indication that the (alleged) coupling unit in the Ueyama reference moves the gradient coil unit relative to the examination space *with the patient bed mechanism*.

In the Ueyama reference, as explained in connection with the prior art illustrated in Figures 1 and 2, the hollow gradient coil 14 is permanently incorporated in the main coil 12 that is used to generate the static magnetic field. At column 1, lines 33-39, it is explicitly stated that the gantry 16 has an opening 18 corresponding to the hollow region of the main coil 12 and the gradient coil 14, and the subject 10 is inserted into this opening 18 of the gantry 16 so that the subject 10 is located in the hollow region of the main coil 12 and the gradient coil 14. This passage clearly indicates that the patient 10 on the patient bed is moved *into* the gradient coil unit, and does not move *with* the gradient coil unit, as explicitly required in claim 1.

Although this structure was described, as noted above, in the Ueyama reference in the context of the prior art shown in Figures 1 and 2 of that reference, this portion of the examination apparatus shown in Figure 4 is not changed, and therefore the aforementioned statements regarding the teachings of the prior art in the Ueyama reference apply equally to the structure disclosed therein that embodies the Ueyama invention.

Moreover, the Examiner stated that the Ueyama reference teaches a cart for receiving the coil unit with connection of the cart to a sensor, the Examiner citing column 5, lines 3-12 for this purpose. Applicants are unable to find any description of such a cart and sensor arrangement at this location in the Ueyama reference, or at any other location therein.

The Examiner also relied on column 5, lines 25-40 and column 6, lines 15-44 as disclosing a guide or control device to guide the gradient coil unit through the examination space. Again, Applicants are unable to find any such information in the cited passages of Ueyama, or in any other passage in that reference. As noted above, the clear teaching of the Ueyama reference is that the gradient coil unit is stationary with regard to the examination space.

The Ueyama reference, therefore, does not disclose all of the elements of claim 1 as arranged and operating in that claim, and thus does not anticipate claim 1, nor any of claims 2-7 depending therefrom. All claims of the application are

therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance. Early reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Submitted by,

Steven H. Noll (Reg. 28,982)

SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 26574
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312/258-5790
Attorneys for Applicants.

CH1\ 4446339.1